



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,186	06/28/2001	Yuen Chuen Chan	774-010087-US (PAR)	5310

2512 7590 03/06/2003

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

SONG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicant No.

09/894,186

Applicant(s)

CHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew J Song

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/27/2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bauser et al (US 5,503,103).

Bauser et al a crucible **10** contains a reservoir **3** for keeping a liquid melt solution **7**, where this reservoir is filled to such a degree, that a substrate and solution are brought into contact by the rotation of the crucible **10** (col 3, ln 5-40). Bauser et al also discloses the pressure can be regulated by the rpm of a centrifuge and the rpm leads to a local supersaturation of the solution at the interface with the substrate, where a crystalline layer **11** grows on the substrate. (col 4, ln 20-40 and col 3, ln 40-60). Bauser et al also teaches the crystalline layer grows completely isothermally (col 4, ln 55-67).

Referring to claim 1, the examiner interprets the pressure changes to the solution caused by the rotation of the centrifuge to read on applicant's varying the pressure of the system

Referring to claim 9, Bauser et al teaches the growth is completed isothermally

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 1765

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardi (US 4,906,325) in view of Dugger (US 5,503,103).

Bernardi discloses a reactor under a hydrogen flow maintained at atmospheric pressure (col 3, ln 35-40) and a growth solution at a temperature of 485°C, this reads on applicant's temperature above the saturation temperature, and by reducing to the solution temperature of 470°C a crystal layer is deposited on a substrate, this reads on applicant's temperature at or below the saturation temperature (col 5, ln 40-67). Bernardi also discloses at a 2 or 3 degree lower temperature for a supersaturation condition allowing growth to start is obtained (col 5, ln 45-55 and Fig 3).

Bernardi discloses lowering temperature to achieve a supersaturation condition. Bernardi does not disclose varying pressure to bring the solution to supersaturation.

In a solution growth method for synthesizing crystals, Dugger teaches the degree of supersaturation can be changed by changes in the pressure of the solution or controlled by a temperature of the solution (col 3, ln 1-25). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bernardi with Dugger's pressure change to bring the solution to supersaturation because operating isothermally avoids undesirable temperature gradients in the melt forming crystals on the sidewalls of the reactor.

Art Unit: 1765

Referring to claim 1, the examiner interpretes changes in the pressure of the solution to read on applicant's pressure of the system.

Referring to claim 9, the combination of Bernardi and Dugger teaches a temperature of 470°C and varying pressure to achieve supersaturation at 470°C.

5. Claims 3-4 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardi (US 4,906,325) in view of Dugger (US 5,503,103) as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Cook (US 4,519,871).

The combination of Bernardi and Dugger teaches all of the limitations of claim 3, as discussed previously in claims 1 and 2, except providing a second growth solution.

In a method of liquid phase epitaxy, Cook teaches a first solution is contacted with a substrate in a channel and an epitaxial layer of a first composition is grown to a desired thickness by liquid phase epitaxy and a second solution, separate from the first solution is then brought in contact with the substrate by moving a bubble across the substrate, thereby sweeping the first solution away and an epitaxial layer of a second composition is then grown on the substrate to a desired thickness by liquid phase epitaxy. Cook also discloses the process can be continued until the desired number of epitaxial layers have been grown on the substrate (col 1, ln 1-45). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Bernardi and Dugger with Cook's second growth solution because it produces superlattice semiconductor structures for use in electronic and optoelectronic devices (col 1, ln 1-5).

Referring to claim 4, the combination of Bernardi, Dugger and Cook teaches repeating the process of contacting the substrate with the first and second growth solution until a desired thickness is achieved.

Referring to claim 6, the combination of Bernardi, Dugger and Cook teaches a first growth solution, a second growth solution and a substrate at atmospheric pressure and heating the growth solutions above a saturation temperature and cooling to below the saturation temperature and varying pressure to control the degree of supersaturation, where a bubble moves the first solution out of contact of the substrate prior to contact with the second solution.

Referring to claim 7, the combination of Bernardi, Dugger and Cook teaches repeating the process of contacting the substrate with the first and second growth solution until a desired thickness is achieved.

6. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardi (US 4,906,325) in view of Dugger (US 5,503,103) as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Hsieh (US 4,142,924).

The combination of Bernardi and Dugger teaches all of the limitations of claim 10, as discussed previously in claims 1-2. The combination of Bernardi and Dugger teaches the deposition of mercury cadmium telluride layers, which is not a III-V epitaxial layer.

In a liquid epitaxy method for growing thin films, Hsieh teaches layers of III-V compounds can be formed from liquid phase epitaxy, where III-V semiconductors include GaSb (col 5, ln 5-20). Hsieh also teaches a GaAs wafer 6, a supersaturated solution of GaAs 8 and the substrate is contacted with the solution to grow a thin film of GaAs on the GaAs wafer at 800°C

Art Unit: 1765

(col 3, ln 1-35 and col 2, ln 50-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Bernardi and Dugger with Hsieh's growth solution of III-V semiconductor compounds because III-V semiconductors are useful in the opto-electronics industry.

Referring to claim 11, the combination of Bernardi, Dugger and Hsieh teaches GaSb.

7. Claims 1 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh (US 4,142,924) in view of Dugger (US 3,933,573).

Hsieh discloses a liquid phase epitaxy growth of GaAs on a GaAs substrate 6 from a solution of GaAs 8, where the growth is carried out under flowing H₂ (col 2, ln 50-67). Hsieh also discloses the solution and the substrate are heated in an oven substantially above their equilibrium temperature, this reads on applicant's saturation temperature, and the solution and substrate are then cooled in the oven to a temperature below the solution equilibrium temperature, where substrate contacts the solution to form a thin layer of GaAs on the GaAs substrate at a temperature of 800°C (col 3, ln 5-60). Hsieh also teaches layers of III-V compounds can be formed from liquid phase epitaxy, where III-V semiconductors include GaSb (col 5, ln 5-20).

Hsieh is silent to varying the pressure of the system to change the degree of supersaturation of the growth solution.

In a solution growth method for synthesizing crystals, Dugger teaches the degree of supersaturation can be changed by changes in the pressure of the solution or controlled by a temperature of the solution (col 3, ln 1-25). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

Art Unit: 1765

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hsieh with Dugger's pressure change change the degree of supersaturation because control of the supersaturation prevents homnogeneous nucleation in the solution, which prohibits growth on a substrate.

Referring to claim 1, the examiner interpretes the changing of the pressure of the solution to read on applicant's pressure of the system.

Referring to claim 8, the combination of Hsieh and Dugger teaches a temperature of 800°C.

Referring to claim 9, the combination of Hsieh and Dugger teaches a temperature of 800°C.

Referring to claim 10, the combination of Hsieh and Dugger teaches GaSb, a group III-V semiconductor.

Referring to claim 11, the combination of Hsieh and Dugger teaches GaSb.

8. Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh (US 4,142,924) in view of Dugger (US 3,933,573) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bernardi (US 4,906,325).

The combination of Hsieh and Dugger teaches all of the limitation of claim 2, as discussed previously in claim 1, except the growth solution and substrate are provided at atmospheric pressure. The combination of Hsieh and Dugger teaches a flow of H₂ is flowed during the growth process but is silent to the pressure.

In a method of forming thin films from solution, Bernardi teaches a hydrogen flow is maintained under atmospheric pressure in order to avoid an oxidative phenomena (col 3, ln 35-

Art Unit: 1765

40). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Hsieh and Dugger with Bernardi's hydrogen pressure of atmospheric pressure because it avoids oxidation.

Referring to claim 5, the combination of Hsieh, Dugger and Bernardi teaches a first growth solution and substrate under a flow of H_2 at atmospheric pressure and heating to above a saturation temperature and cooling to below the saturation temperature and maintaining at $800^\circ C$ while varying pressure to control the degree of supersaturation and contacting the substrate with the solution thereby forming a thin film, i.e. solid layer.

9. Claims 3-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh (US 4,142,924) in view of Dugger (US 3,933,573) along with Bernardi (US 4,906,325) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Cook (US 4,519,871).

In a method of liquid phase epitaxy, Cook teaches a first solution is contacted with a substrate in a channel and an epitaxial layer of a first composition is grown to a desired thickness by liquid phase epitaxy and a second solution, separate from the first solution is then brought in contact with the substrate by moving a bubble across the substrate, thereby sweeping the first solution away and an epitaxial layer of a second composition is then grown on the substrate to a desired thickness by liquid phase epitaxy. Cook also discloses the process can be continued until the desired number of epitaxial layers have been grown on the substrate (col 1, ln 1-45). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Hsieh, Dugger and Bernardi with Cook's second growth solution because it

Art Unit: 1765

produces superlattice semiconductor structures for use in electronic and optoelectronic devices (col 1, ln 1-5).

Referring to claim 4, the combination of Hsieh, Dugger, Bernardi and Cook teaches varying pressure of a second growth solution controls the degree of supersaturation.

Referring to claim 5, the combination of Hsieh, Dugger, Bernardi and Cook teaches heating above an equilibrium temperature, this reads on applicant's saturation temperature under atmospheric pressure and setting the temperature below the saturation temperature and varying the pressure to control the degree of supersaturation and contacting a substrate with a growth solution, thereby depositing a thin film, i.e. solid layer.

Referring to claim 6, the combination of Hsieh, Dugger, Bernardi and Cook teaches heating above an equilibrium temperature, this reads on applicant's saturation temperature under atmospheric pressure and setting the temperature below the saturation temperature and varying the pressure to control the degree of supersaturation and contacting a substrate with a growth solution, thereby depositing a thin film, i.e. solid layer. The combination of Hsieh, Dugger, Bernardi and Cook also teaches a first growth solution is moved from the substrate by a bubble, this reads on applicant's moving the substrate out of contact with the first growth solution.

Referring to claim 7, the combination of Hsieh, Dugger, Bernardi and Cook teaches repeating steps until a desired thickness is achieved.

Referring to claim 8, the combination of Hsieh, Dugger, Bernardi and Cook teaches a temperature of 800°C.

Referring to claim 9, the combination of Hsieh, Dugger, Bernardi and Cook teaches a constant temperature.

Art Unit: 1765

Referring to claim 10, the combination of Hsieh, Dugger, Bernardi and Cook teaches GaAs a group III-V semiconductor.

Referring to claim 11, the combination of Hsieh, Dugger, Bernardi and Cook teaches GaSb.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 12/27/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Nishizawa rejection is withdrawn.

In response to applicant's argument that it is incorrect to interpret the centrifugal force used in Bauser as being equivalent to the pressure in the present invention is note but has not been found persuasive. Applicant admits in the arguments that "the centrifugal force-based pressure change to the growth solution in Bauser" (pg 6, 3rd paragraph). The Bauser reference does teach a pressure change to the growth solution, which effects the supersaturation of the solution.

In response to applicant's argument that the pressure change of Bauser is not equivalent to the pressure variation described in the present invention is noted but has not been found persuasive. Although the Bauser reference is limited as suggested by applicant, the instantly claimed invention does not require pressure variations lower than atmospheric pressure. Furthermore, applicant's argument that the Bauser reference is not equivalent to the pressure variation described in the present invention is an opinion without any factual support

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., there is no flexibility in determining the determining the material composition of the layers grown as the respective concentration gradient masses (pg 6)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that although the Dugger reference discloses that the degree of supersaturation in a solution can be changed by changing the pressure of the solution, it actually varies the supersaturation by changing the temperature, therefore points away from varying the pressure is noted but has not been found persuasive. The Dugger reference clearly discloses the limitation of changing the degree of supersaturation in a solution by changing the pressure of the solution. The Dugger reference also teaches varying the temperature to change the degree of supersaturation, however this is only one particular method, which is taught by Dugger. The Dugger reference does not teach varying the pressure provides negative results compared to varying the temperature; therefore does not point away from changing the pressure as suggested by applicant.

In response to applicant's argument that the Dugger reference is in a different technical field to Bernardi and the skilled man would therefore not think to combine Bernardi and Dugger has been noted but has not been found persuasive. The Dugger and Bernardi references both pertain to single crystal growth from solutions. Furthermore, both of the references are classified in the same US class and subclass.

In response to applicant's argument that the skilled man would not look to Dugger when seeking to address the problems solved by the present invention as it does not address the same problem is noted but has been found persuasive. The applicant has supplied an opinion without any factual support. The Dugger reference relates to a method of growing single crystals, therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Dugger's teaching of controlling pressure in a method of growing crystalline films.

In response to applicant's argument that the Dugger reference does not suggest the benefits obtained when using the method of the present invention (pg 8) has been noted but has not been found persuasive. The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant (MPEP 2144).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Cook et al, Hsieh et al, and Bernardi et al are not relied upon to teach varying the pressure to control supersaturation, this limitation is taught by the Dugger reference.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1765

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Porowski et al (US 5,637,531) teaches a method of making a crystalline structure at two pressures, where the a lower pressure results in a slower growth rate (Abstract).

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J Song whose telephone number is 703-305-4953. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benjamin L Utech can be reached on 703-308-3868. The fax phone numbers for the


Art Unit: 1765

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Matthew J Song
Examiner
Art Unit 1765

MJS
February 28, 2003


BENJAMIN L. UTECH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700